

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing remarks, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 11, and 17 being the independent claims. Claims 11 and 17 are sought be amended herein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0030950 to Chen et al. (herein "Chen") in view of United States Patent No. 6,526,581 to Edson (herein "Edson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide the following arguments to support patentability as follows:

Claim 1 is directed to a communications system. The communications system includes:

a plurality of media terminal adapters coupled to a first telephone line;

a second telephone line;

an analog telephone coupled to the second telephone line;

a gateway coupled to the first and second telephone lines and an internet protocol (IP) network, and configured to exchange voice and/or data packets between the IP network, each of the media terminal adapters over the first telephone line, and the analog telephone over the second telephone line,

wherein the gateway receives a packet payload from the IP network and determines if the received packet payload is a voice packet or a data packet, if the received packet payload is a voice packet, the gateway further determines if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone or a media terminal adapter,

if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone, the gateway depacketizes the voice packet, generates an analog voice signal, and transmits the analog voice signal via the second telephone line to the analog telephone,

if the voice packet is destined for the media terminal adapter, the gateway reformats the voice packet and transmits the reformatted voice packet via the first telephone line to the media terminal adapter.

(*see*, claim 1)

As stated in the Office Action dated March 6, 2007 (herein “Office Action”), Chen does not teach or suggest at least the feature of “the gateway receives a packet payload from the IP network and determines if the received packet payload is a voice packet or a data packet, if the received packet payload is a voice packet, the gateway further determines if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone or a media terminal adapter, if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone, the gateway depacketizes the voice packet, generates an analog voice signal, and transmits the analog voice signal via the second telephone line to the analog telephone, if the voice packet is destined for the media terminal adapter, the gateway reformats the voice packet and transmits the reformatted voice packet via the first telephone line” as recited by claim 1. (*see*, Office Action, Page 2 through Page 3). For the reasons to be discussed below, Edson does not provide the missing teaching or suggestion with respect to claim 1.

The Office Action alleges a router within the gateway of Edson teaches or suggests a gateway to “[to depacket] the voice packet, [to generate] an analog voice signal, and [to transmit] the analog voice signal via the second telephone line to the

analog telephone” “if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone” and/or a gateway “[to reformat] the voice packet and [to transmit] the reformatted voice packet via the first telephone line” “if the voice packet is destined for the media terminal adapter” as recited by claim 1. (*see*, Office Action, Page 3).

The gateway of Edson communicates with devices through a physical home media, such as a telephone line or a power line through an external device interface. (*see*, Edson, col. 7, lines 58-60). The device interface implements “a physical/electrical interface for the particular device.” (*see*, Edson, col. 8, lines 11-13). According to Edson, the device interface emulates an analog type plain old telephone service (POTS) type line appearance when connected to a standard analog telephone. (*see*, Edson, col. 8, lines 15-18).

However, the gateway of Edson does not provide the interface functions to the individual devices 31-34. Accordingly, multiple device interfaces 311-314 are required in Edson. (*see*, Edson, FIG. 1). For example, the device interfaces of Edson provide the necessary conversions between digital and analog and send and receive data messages over the physical home media relating to the standard telephone line signaling used by the POTS telephone. (*see*, Edson, col. 8, lines 19-23). This processing “entails digital compression decompression, packet assembly/disassembly and appropriate signaling to enable Internet Protocol (IP) transport of the telephone communication signals, for example through the [gateway] and one of the high-speed links to the public Internet.” (*see*, Edson, col. 8, lines 24-29).

Accordingly, the gateway of Edson does not provide the “[depacketizing of] the voice packet, [generating] an analog voice signal, and [transmitting] the analog voice

signal via the second telephone line to the analog telephone" ... "if the voice packet is destined for the analog telephone", nor the "[reformatting] the voice packet and [transmitting] the reformatted voice packet via the first telephone line" ... "if the voice packet is destined for the media terminal adapter", as recited by claim 1.

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 recites a "gateway to [to depacket] the voice packet, [to generate] an analog voice signal, and [to transmit] the analog voice signal via the second telephone line to the analog telephone...", among other features. Accordingly, multiple interfaces are not necessary in Applicant's configuration.

Based on the discussion above, the combination of Chen and Edson does not render obvious independent claim 1. Dependent claims 2-10 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Edson for the same reasons as the independent claim from which they respectively depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 11 is directed to a method of communicating voice over internet protocol (IP). The method includes the steps of:

receiving a packet payload from an IP network by a gateway ;

determining by the gateway if the received packet payload is voice packet or data packet;

if the received packet payload is a voice packet, further determining by the gateway if the voice packet is destined for a telephone coupled to a first telephone line or a second network coupled to a second telephone line and having a plurality of media adapter terminals;

depacketizing the voice packet, generating an analog voice signal, and transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line by the gateway to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone; and

reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the second phone line to the second network by the gateway, if the voice packet is destined for the second network.

(*see*, claim 11).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim 11 as amended is patentable over the art of record. For example, the combination of Chen and Edson does not teach or suggest at least the steps of "depacketizing the voice packet, generating an analog voice signal, and transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line by the gateway to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone" and/or "reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the second phone line to the second network by the gateway, if the voice packet is destined for the second network" as recited by claim 11. Dependents claim 12-16 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Edson for the same reason as claim 11 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 17 is directed to a gateway for a communication system. The gateway includes:

means for receiving a packet payload from an internet protocol (IP) network;

means for determining if the received packet payload is voice packet or data packet;

if the received packet payload is a voice packet, means for determining if the voice packet is destined for a telephone coupled to a first telephone line or a second network coupled to a second telephone line and having a plurality of media adapter terminals;

means for depacketizing the voice packet, means for generating an analog voice signal, and means for transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone; and

means for reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the second phone line to the second network, if the voice packet is destined for the second network.

(*see, claim 17*).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claim 17 as amended is patentable over the art of record. For example, the combination of Chen and Edson does not teach or suggest a gateway including a "means for depacketizing the voice packet, means for generating an analog voice signal, and means for transmitting the analog voice signal over the first phone line to the telephone if the voice packet is destined for the telephone" and/or a "means for reformatting the voice packet and transmitting the reformatted voice packet over the second phone line to the second network, if the voice packet is destined for the second network" as recited by claim 17. Dependents claim 18-20 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Chen and Edson for the same reason as claim 17 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the

Amdt. dated July 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 6, 2007

- 14 -

RABENKO *et al.*
Appl. No. 09/851,722

outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 7/6/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
651935_2.DOC